APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,802	02/27/2004	Alexander J. Somogyi	ORACL-01338US2	7862

80548   7590   08/17/2009
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 CALIFORNIA STREET
14TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAMQUY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2195	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/17/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OFFICEACTIONS@FDML.COM

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 May 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is FINAL.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>12-31</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>12-31</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 12-31 are presented for examination. Claims 1-11 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 12-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over

Connor (6,865,549) in view of Orton et al. (U.S. Patent 5,465,363).

4.   As to claims 12, 22 and 31, Connor teaches the invention substantially as

claimed including: a system for interleaving resource enlistment synchronization,

comprising:

   a transaction manager, wherein the transaction manager maintains an

enlistment data structure to manage resource object enlistment in one or more

transactions (controller service 320 maintains a table 322 of controller ID/lease object

pairs that have been issued to registered controllers, col. 5, lines 22-28);

   wherein, after receives a request from one of the plurality of threads to

enlist one of the one or more resource objects (controller 302 registers with

controller service 320 to receive controller ID 304 and lease object 306, col. 10, lines

60-62; col. 5, lines 32-39), the transaction manager

> **first checks to see if there is a lock being held on the resource object**
>
> **by another thread** (the system determines if controller 302 holds a lock on the
>
> lockable resource (step 504 or the lock can be controlled by different controllers,
>
> col. 5, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 22-25);
>
> **if not, grants a lock to an accessor associated with the thread** (the
>
> system causes controller 302 to be noted as the lock owner, col. 5, lines 66-67)
>
> **and holds the lock until an owner of the thread delists the resource object**
>
> (controller 302 can cancel the lease to indicate that the controller 302 no longer
>
> holds the lock 308… the record in service controller will removed, col. 5, lines 7-
>
> 30).

5.   Connor does not explicitly teach an application server with a plurality of threads,

running on one or more processors; one or more resource objects, wherein each

resource object is wrapped with a wrapper object, wherein the transaction manager

uses the wrapper object to synchronize concurrent enlistment requests. However, Orton

teaches **an application server with a plurality of threads, running on one or more**

processors (a computer system where more than one application program, or more

than one thread of execution in that application program 102 can be operational at the

same time, col. 3, lines 25-28); **one or more resource objects** (non-multitask safe

object, col. 16, lines 46-49), **wherein each resource object is wrapped with a**

wrapper object (non-multitask-safe object which is "caught" and implemented by the

multitask-safe object wrapper, col. 16, lines 46-49; col. 18, lines 20-25), **wherein the**

transaction manager uses the wrapper object to synchronize concurrent

enlistment requests (col. 18, lines 34-42; col. 18, line 63 – col. 19, line 4).

6.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made that to modify the teaching of Connor to incorporate the teaching of

an application server with a plurality of threads, running on one or more processors; one

or more resource objects, wherein each resource object is wrapped with a wrapper

object, wherein the transaction manager uses the wrapper object to synchronize

concurrent enlistment requests as taught by Orton in order to gain the advantage of

possible to use objects that are not task-safe in a multitasking environment without

modifying or understanding the internal workings of the said objects.

7.   As to claims 13 and 23, Orton teaches the transaction manager maintains a

collection of wrapper objects that wraps the one or more resource objects (non-

multitask-safe object which is "caught" and implemented by the multitask-safe object

wrapper, col. 16, lines 46-49; col. 18, lines 20-25).

8.   As to claims 14 and 24, Connor teaches the collection of wrapper objects is

periodically processed to remove objects that are unused or no longer active (col. 5,

lines 28-30).

9.   As to claim 15, Orton teaches teach of the one or more resource objects resides
in a server node (col. 18, lines 15-26).

10.   As to claims 16, 25, Orton teaches the transaction manager signals to one or
more waiting threads once a lock is free (col. 18, lines 53-55).

11.   As to claims 17 and 26, Connor teaches the transaction manager use a priority
method to determine which thread will be granted a lock (col. 1, lines 33-40).

12.   As to claims 18 and 27, Orton teaches after obtains a lock, the thread uses the
wrapper object to initiate work on the resource object (col. 18, lines 21-26).

13.   As to claims 19 and 28, Orton teaches the wrapper object receives a delist call
from the transaction manager and send an end call to the resource object to end work
performed by the resource object associated with the thread and release the lock on the
resource object (col. 18, lines 34-42).

14.   As to claims 20 and 29, Connor teaches once the transaction manager enlists
the resource object and obtains a lock to the resource object, any attempted enlist from
a second thread is blocked (col. 6, lines 19-35).

15.   As to claims 21 and 30, Connor teaches the enlistment data structure maintains

a mapping of resources and transaction identification information in use (col. 5, lines 20-30).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CAMQUY TRUONG whose telephone number is (571)272-3773. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng Ai An can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/   Camquy Truong
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195
                                                            August 4, 2009